



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON D.C., 20460

OFFICE OF
PREVENTION, PESTICIDES AND TOXIC
SUBSTANCES

MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT: Draft FY 2009 National Program Manager (NPM) Guidance to Regions

FROM: James B. Gulliford
Assistant Administrator

TO: Regional Division Directors I-X

I am pleased to transmit the draft OPPTS FY 2009 National Program Manager Guidance. This guidance is the result of a multi-year process to align Agency, State and Tribal processes to strengthen and focus our joint strategic planning.

Overarching Program Priorities

The OPPTS guidance for FY 2009 represents a participatory dialogue with the Regions, States, Tribes, and other concerned stakeholders. It addresses the critical Regional activities that are directed at achieving the goals for environmental and public health protection contained in the *2006-2011 EPA Strategic Plan* (<http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/plan/plan.htm>). Included in the Guidance are priority program areas that were identified by the Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics (OPPT), and the Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP).

OPPT promotes the use of safer chemicals through a combination of regulatory and voluntary efforts, promotes pollution prevention as the guiding principle for controlling industrial pollution, and promotes risk reduction to minimize exposure to existing chemicals. OPPT's Regional performance priorities include critical activities within lead, asbestos, Pollution Prevention and the CARE programs. OPPT is continuing with the High Production Volume (HPV) Challenge program through the Security and Prosperity Partnership (SPP) by developing risk based prioritizations for High and Moderate production volume chemicals which combine both hazard and exposure information. OPPT's objectives and measures are found in goals 4 and 5 of the *2006-2011 EPA Strategic Plan*. Go to <http://www.epa.gov/opptintr/> for more information on OPPT.

OPP regulates the use of all pesticides in the United States and establishes maximum levels for pesticide residues in food, thereby safeguarding the nation's food supply. EPA has expanded access to information on risk assessment and risk management actions to help increase transparency of decision-making and facilitate consultation with the public and affected stakeholders. In addition to its regulatory functions, OPP's programs include providing information and coordination on issues ranging from worker protection to prevention of misuse of pesticides. OPP participates in a variety of partnerships related to pesticide use, including the Pesticide Environmental Stewardship Program, a voluntary private and public partnership dedicated to reducing pesticide use and risk, and Integrated Pest Management (IPM) in Schools. OPP's Regional performance priorities include the issue areas of pesticides and endangered species, pesticide worker safety, the Strategic Agricultural Initiative (SAI), pesticides and water resource protection, and implementation of the Pesticide Container-Containment Rule. OPP objectives and measures are found in goal 4 of the *2006-2011 EPA Strategic Plan*. Go to <http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/> for more information on OPP.

Regional Priorities and Flexibility

As with previous years, cross-cutting considerations should be factored into the implementation strategies for program priorities. These cross-cutting considerations include Regional priorities, Environmental Justice (EJ) and Children's Health programs. Additional language has been added throughout the guidance to highlight those activities. OPPTS programs understand that the priorities highlighted in the guidance will require some flexibility in order to accommodate Regional, State, Tribal and local concerns on a region-by-region basis. We will continue to foster innovation and re-engineer the way we work together to establish common directions for our programs.

Strengthening State Grants

EPA has worked with State and Tribal partners and other grant recipients to improve performance measures and enhance the alignment of State Grant Workplan goals and measures with EPA's national performance goals and measures. These improvements have enhanced the Agency's ability to demonstrate grant results to OMB, Congress and the public. It is important that EPA and the States and Tribes build on these efforts to ensure that grant workplans meet the basic requirements necessary to facilitate the translation of grant results into the Agency's strategic and annual planning, budgeting, and accountability processes.

Improvements have been made to the performance measure templates for State Grant Workplans to further EPA's efforts to develop a standardized template for Performance Partnership Grants and other categorical grant agreements. These templates are included as an Appendix to this document (Appendix B). This template attempts to capture the most essential measures for describing the environmental and program results associated with each of the categorical grants. Additional information on overall grants improvements and the grants management process can be found at <http://www.epa.gov/ogd>.

FY 2009 Performance Measurement and Alignment

A point of emphasis in planning that culminates in issuance of the OPPTS NPM Guidance for FY 2009, the program has undergone an extended and rigorous assessment of performance measures used to evaluate progress and plan future activities. Key objectives of this effort focused on:

- Aligning national priorities with long-term directions in the *2006-2011 EPA Strategic Plan* and annual priorities in EPA's FY 2009 Annual Plan and Budget;
- Streamlining the number of reporting requirements and annual measures that the Agency uses to manage environmental progress and recognizing the set of key measures used by each management level;
- Integrating regional priorities and regional priority measures;
- Advancing the Agency's process for developing and reporting against state grant template performance measures; and
- Enhancing collaboration within EPA and with our state and tribal partners.

The FY 2009 NPM Guidance emphasizes alignment between performance measures that demonstrate overall program results and regional measures that are reported in the Agency's accountability system, the *Annual Commitment System* (ACS). OPPTS Regional and Headquarters programs, in partnership with States and other interested stakeholders, have made considerable progress in designing a suite of limited regional performance measures which support planning and budgeting requirements as prescribed by the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) and the Performance Assessment Rating Tool (PART).

The alignment of ACS measures with other Agency performance systems is discussed throughout this document. Appendix A contains a list of FY 2009 ACS measures is contained as an Appendix to this document. In additional, a draft list of significant changes from the FY 2008 guidance is included in the Appendix C.

The FY 2009 ACS commitments will remain as draft until final performance agreements are reached in October 2009. A list of key milestones in reaching these agreements is included in Appendix D. Additional information on the EPA performance measurement, planning and budgeting can be found at <http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/index.htm>. Specific information on the EPA NPM Guidance can be found at <http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/npmguidance/index.htm>.

Conclusion

Thank you for your ongoing assistance in drafting the guidance. OPPTS remains committed to this partnership process and believes that our mutual efforts will focus and strengthen our activities in the field. I look forward to our continued collaboration on solving the many environmental challenges that we face now and in the future.

For general comments or questions, please contact either Eric Burman (202-564-0267) or Michael O'Reilly (202-564-0551). For program-specific questions you may contact Daniel Helfgott (OPP/ Field & External Affairs Division; 703-308-8054), Brian Symmes (OPPT/National Program Chemicals Division; Lead and Asbestos, 202-566-1983), Thomas Tillman (OPPT/ Pollution Prevention Division; 202-564-8263) or Deldi Reyes (OPPT/CARE; 202 564-1465).

Attachments

cc: Deputy Regional Administrators
OPPTS Regional Branch Chiefs
Assistant Administrators

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	I
PROGRAM PRIORITIES	I
IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES	II
SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO PRIORITIES OR STRATEGIES FROM FY 2008	IV
PROGRAM OFFICE CONTACTS.....	IV
KEY PROGRAM PRIORITIES AND STRATEGIES	1
LEAD	1
<i>Strategic Plan Targets</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Long-Term Strategy</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Environmental Justice.....</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Background.....</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Proposed Measures of Success</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Definitions and Clarification of Measures.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Proposed Principal Activities for the Regions</i>	<i>4</i>
ASBESTOS.....	5
<i>Strategic Plan Target.....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Long-Term Strategy</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Background.....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Proposed Measures of Success</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Definitions and Clarification of Measures.....</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Proposed Principal Activities for the Regions</i>	<i>6</i>
COMMUNITY ACTION FOR A RENEWED ENVIRONMENT (CARE)	7
<i>Strategic Plan Target.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Long-Term Strategy</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Background.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Proposed Measures of Success</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Proposed Principal Activities for the Regions</i>	<i>8</i>
POLLUTION PREVENTION (P2)	9
<i>Strategic Plan Targets</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Annual Targets.....</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Long-Term Strategy</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Background.....</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Proposed Measures of Success</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>Definitions and Clarification of Measures.....</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Proposed Principal Activities of the Regions.....</i>	<i>13</i>
PESTICIDE WORKER SAFETY PROGRAMS	14
<i>Strategic Plan Targets</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Strategy.....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Background.....</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>Environmental Justice.....</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Proposed Measures of Success</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Proposed Principal Activities for the Regions</i>	<i>17</i>
PESTICIDE CONTAINER-CONTAINMENT IMPLEMENTATION	19
<i>Strategic Target.....</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Three-year Strategy.....</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Background.....</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Proposed Measures of Success</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Proposed Principal Activities for the Regions</i>	<i>20</i>
PESTICIDES & ENDANGERED SPECIES	21
<i>Strategic Target.....</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>Strategy.....</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>Background.....</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>Proposed Measures of Success</i>	<i>23</i>

<i>Proposed Principle Activities for the Regions</i>	<i>23</i>
PESTICIDES AND WATER RESOURCE PROTECTION	23
<i>Strategic Plan Target.....</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>Strategy.....</i>	<i>24</i>
<i>Background.....</i>	<i>24</i>
<i>Proposed Measures of Success</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>Principal Activities for the Regions</i>	<i>25</i>
STRATEGIC AGRICULTURE INITIATIVE (SAI).....	26
<i>Strategic Plan Target.....</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>Strategy.....</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>Background.....</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>Proposed Measures of Success</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>Measures Justification and Calculation.....</i>	<i>27</i>
<i>Proposed Principal Activities for the Regions</i>	<i>27</i>
APPENDIX A: FY2009 NPM GUIDANCE MEASURES	29
APPENDIX B: FY 2009 STATE GRANT TEMPLATE MEASURES.....	37
APPENDIX C: EXPLANATION OF CHANGES FROM FY 2008 TO FY 2009.....	38
APPENDIX D: KEY MILESTONES FOR THE NEGOTIATION AND AGREEMENT OF FY 2009	
PERFORMANCE COMMITMENTS.....	43

Draft OPPTS FY 2009 NPM Guidance

Executive Summary

The OPPTS Guidance for FY 2009 represents a participatory dialogue with the Regions, States, Tribes, and other concerned stakeholders. It addresses the critical Regional activities that are directed at achieving the goals for environmental and public health protection contained in the *2006-2011 EPA Strategic Plan* (<http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/plan/plan.htm>). Included in the Guidance are priority program areas that were identified by the Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics (OPPT), and the Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP).

Below are highlights from OPPT and OPP, and policy statements that extend over the more detailed programmatic discussion in the section on key program priorities and strategies.

PROGRAM PRIORITIES

The Regional performance priorities for FY 2009 for OPPT are: Lead, Community Action for a Renewed Environment (CARE), and Pollution Prevention (P2).

The Lead Program's goal is to virtually eliminate childhood lead poisoning as a public health concern by 2010. Both OPPT and Regions will pursue a combination of approaches and activities that offer the most promise for an effective national program. Priorities for the Lead program in FY 2009 are to:

(1) Ensure an adequate workforce of trained and certified lead-based paint professionals, including the addition of programs aimed at implementing the Renovation, Remodeling, and Painting (RRP) rule; (2) Improve methods to reach communities with a high concentration of children with elevated blood-lead levels (hot spots) and population of children vulnerable to lead risks; and (3) Coordinate with other Federal Agencies such as Center for Disease Control (CDC), Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and others to address gaps in the protection of children at risk for elevated blood-lead levels.

The CARE program serves as a gateway to help communities access the range of tools and resources available to develop community partnerships, undertake broad-based risk assessments, and implement actions to reduce risks. Headquarters and Regions will support CARE communities' efforts to assess and reduce environmental risks within their communities. CARE provides financial assistance by funding cooperative agreements with communities. The CARE program priorities are to: (1) Reduce exposure to toxic pollutants through collaborative action at the local level; (2) Help communities understand all potential sources of exposure to toxic pollutants; (3) Work with communities to set priorities for risk reduction activities; and (4) Create self-sustaining, community-based partnerships to improve the local environment.

The Pollution Prevention (P2) Program is one of EPA's primary tools for encouraging environmental stewardship by the Federal government, industry, communities, and individuals. OPPT and Regional offices will identify better environmental strategies and solutions for reducing or eliminating waste at the source. Specific program priorities for P2 are to:

(1) Conduct Regional P2 outreach efforts to provide P2 tools and technical assistance to stakeholders in accordance with State and regional priorities and the P2 needs of their customers;

(2) Promote the reduction of Greenhouse Gas (GHG) in accordance with Administrator's priorities of clean energy and climate change; (3) Strengthen cross-office coordination to integrate P2 across the Agency and promote P2 outcomes; (4) Continue to engage in P2 strategic planning and implement priority activities; and (5) Continue to integrate grant activities with environmental performance results.

The Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP) Regional performance priorities for FY 2009 continue to be the same as for FY 2008, which are: (1) Pesticide Worker Safety, (2) Pesticide Container/Containment Implementation, (3) Pesticides and Endangered Species, (4) Pesticides and Water Resource Protection program, and (5) FQPA/Strategic Agricultural Initiative (SAI). These Regional priorities continue to address the goals of the EPA Strategic Plan and the Assistant Administrator's OPPTS Action Plan. Specifically, the SAI measure addresses the Partnerships and Pollution prevention goal demonstrating results through collaboration and innovation, while the Pesticide Worker Safety priority addresses the action plan goal of ensuring safe pesticides.

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

OPPT will continue to implement the lead-based paint activities through the training and certification program in areas without authorization through direct implementation. Regions will continue providing assistance to States, Tribes, the District of Columbia, and territories to develop and implement authorized programs for lead-based paint remediation. OPPT and Regions will implement EPA's recently initiated RRP Rule to reduce exposure to lead-based hazards from activities that disturb lead-based paint by establishing requirements for renovation work practices, training and certifying renovators and dust sampling technicians, certifying renovation firms, accrediting providers of renovation and dust sampling technician training. OPPT will work with the Regions to identify resources and approaches they will need to assist in implementing RRP requirements, and lay the groundwork for smooth implementation by the 2009 effective date.

Regions will utilize the CARE program to assist communities by providing information about the pollution risks they face. In addition, Regions will provide communities' access to voluntary programs to address local environmental priorities and improve the environment through local action. CARE expects to award about \$2.5 million in FY 2009 for two levels of cooperative agreements. Level I cooperative agreements will help establish community-based partnerships and set priorities for reducing toxic risks in a given community. Level II cooperative agreements will be for communities that already have a broad-based collaborative partnership, have identified risk reduction priorities, and are ready to implement risk reduction strategies.

The Pollution Prevention (P2) Program employs a combination of collaborative efforts, innovative programs, and technical assistance and education to support stakeholder efforts to minimize and prevent adverse environmental impacts by preventing the generation of pollution at the source. The Regional grants are a vehicle to implement these innovative P2 strategies. State and Tribal assistance grants are awarded by EPA's Regional Offices to support the P2 national measures. In addition to supporting traditional P2 technical assistance programs, many states have utilized P2 Grants to assist businesses by initiating regulatory integration projects to

develop prevention strategies in state core media programs. States also have established programs in non-industrial sectors such as agriculture, energy, health, and transportation. Approximately 30 Source Reduction Assistance (SRA) grants are anticipated in FY 2009. These SRA grants utilize EPM resources to implement a wide variety of P2 solutions.

For FY 2009, Regions will continue providing assistance to States and Tribes on the program priorities of Container-Containment, Endangered Species, Worker Safety, Water Quality, and Strategic Agricultural Initiative. EPA protects workers, pesticide applicators/handlers, employers, and the public from the potential risks posed by pesticides in their homes and work environments specifically through the Certification and Training/Worker Protection programs. EPA will continue to provide assistance and grants to implement the Certification and Training/Worker Protection programs. Grant funding will provide for maintenance and improvements in training networks, safety training to workers and pesticide handlers, development of *Train the Trainer* courses, workshops, and development and distribution of outreach materials. The Agency's partnership with states and tribes in educating workers, farmers, and employers on the safe use of pesticides and worker safety will continue to be a major keystone in the success of the Agency's human health protection (see <http://www.epa.gov/oppfod01/safety/applicators/applicators.htm>).

Additionally in FY 2009, as in past years, EPA will be complying with Endangered Species Act requirements to ensure that its regulatory decisions are not likely to jeopardize species listed as endangered and threatened, or harm habitat critical to those species' survival. EPA will provide grants to states and tribes for projects supporting endangered species protection. Program implementation includes outreach, communication, education related to use limitations, review and distribution of Endangered Species Protection Bulletins, and mapping and development of endangered species protection plans. This initiative supports the Agency's mission to protect the environment from pesticide risk.

Protecting the nation's water sources from possible pesticide contamination is another component of EPA's environmental protection efforts in FY 2009. As in prior years, the Agency will continue to provide funding through cooperative agreements to states and Tribal pesticide lead agencies to investigate and respond to water resource contamination by pesticides. States and tribes are also expected to evaluate local pesticides that have potential to contaminate water resources, and take steps to prevent or reduce contamination where pesticide concentrations approach or exceed levels of concern.

Implementation of the Container-Containment rule is designed to minimize human exposure while handling pesticide containers; facilitate safe container disposal and recycling; protect the environment from pesticide releases at bulk storage sites and from spills and leaks at refilling and dispensing operations. The Office of Pesticide Programs has made implementation of this rule a priority. Therefore, this guidance will emphasize Headquarters and Regional activities to help prepare state partners for implementation, which is a necessary step in ensure the requirements of the rule are followed by pesticide registrants, distributors and users, and the human health and environmental protections are realized in the field. Additional information on the rule can be found at <http://epa.gov/pesticides/regulating/containers.htm>.

The Strategic Agricultural initiative develops pest management strategies to identify alternatives to harmful pesticides. In FY 2009, Regions will continue to use assistance agreements to fund projects that promote model agricultural partnership projects that demonstrate and facilitate the adoption of farm management decisions and practices that provide growers with "a reasonable transition" away from the highest risk pesticides – as designated by FQPA. Regions will also conduct outreach with producers, commodity groups, and other stakeholders to create and maintain partnerships with the agricultural community, and will commit to record all outreach and collaborative actions in the SAI Activities Database.

SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO PRIORITIES OR STRATEGIES FROM FY 2008

OPPT has introduced four new measures in FY2009. Two new ACS reporting measures align with the Renovation, Remodeling, and Painting (RRP) rule commencement. The measures will focus on accrediting training providers and issuing certifications for RRP activities. The CARE Executive committee developed a new ACS measure. The accountability for this new ACS measure will be transferred from NPM to NPM each time the co-leadership for CARE changes. The measure will track the number of projects supported by the Regions. The Pollution Prevention (P2) Program is introducing a new national and ACS measure which tracks the Metric Tons of Carbon Equivalent (MTCE). This measure will begin the transition away from BTUs and align the program with approaches taken by other EPA offices.

The Performance Measure Template for State and Tribal Grant Workplans for pesticide program implementation continue to be included for FY 2009. This measure was first required by OMB in FY 2007 to provide a meaningful comparison of states activities. EPA and the states have learned many lessons in working through FY 2007 implementation issues. As a result of the lessons learned through FY 2007 implementation of the State Grant Template, the State Grant Template measure will change starting in FY 2009 to better reflect the actual state grant activities funded by EPA's grant dollars than the previous measure, and permit more meaningful comparability between states, and will enable identification of trends in certification. Additionally, the revised measure is subject to less annual variability and has less potential for misinterpretation.

In addition, the text of some of the pesticides field program measures has been revised (compared to the text in the NPM guidance for FY 2008) to improve the quality of the measures as a result of meeting required measures criteria outlined in the OCFO Technical Guidance for FY 2009, and to better reflect the goals of the Strategic Plan.

PROGRAM OFFICE CONTACTS

Office of Pesticide Programs Field & External Affairs Division, Daniel Helfgott 703-308-8054
Office of Pollution Prevention & Toxics - Lead and Asbestos, Brian Symmes 202-566-1983
Office of Pollution Prevention & Toxics- Pollution Prevention, Thomas Tillman 202-564-8263
Office of Pollution Prevention & Toxics – CARE, Deldi Reyes 202-564-1465

Key Program Priorities and Strategies

LEAD

Strategic Plan Targets

- Sub-Objective: 4.1.1 Reduce Chemical Risks. By 2011, prevent and reduce chemical risks to humans, communities, and ecosystems.
 - By 2010, eliminate childhood lead poisoning as a public health concern by reducing to 0 the number of cases of children (aged 1-5 years) with elevated blood lead levels (>10 $\mu\text{g/dl}$).
 - By 2012, reduce to 27% the percent difference in the geometric mean blood lead level in low income children 1-5 years old as compared to the geometric mean for non-low income children 1-5 years old.

Long-Term Strategy

OPPT will pursue a range of activities aimed at meeting our strategic targets, including the maintenance of a trained and certified workforce of lead-based paint professionals, and the development of methods and tools to reach vulnerable populations and communities. In its efforts to meet the needs of environmental justice communities, OPPT has collaborated with other agencies and national organizations in low-income housing communities to raise awareness and help attain the goal of reducing childhood lead poisonings in areas with high occurrences of elevated blood-lead levels.

In January 2006, EPA proposed new requirements to reduce exposure to lead hazards created by renovation, repair, and painting activities that disturb lead-based paint. The proposal establishes requirements for renovation work practices; training and certifying renovators and dust sampling technicians; certifying renovation firms; and accrediting providers of renovation and dust sampling technician training. The Renovation, Repair and Painting (RRP) Rule will be finalized in March 2008, with an effective date of March 2009.

Environmental Justice

The lead program has awarded grants to conduct activities to reduce incidences of childhood lead poisoning in vulnerable populations and other environmental justice activities including outreach and public education in appropriate languages of the community, monitoring, training, and other innovative means of communication with communities regarding reducing the risk of lead poisoning. This includes continued administration of the State Tribal Assistance Grants (STAG) program which maintains an adequate supply of trained and certified individuals for lead-based paint activities. In addition these grants support Tribal efforts to reduce lead risks, and focus on reducing lead risks in vulnerable populations of at-risk children and communities with a high concentration of children with elevated blood-lead levels (hot spots). OPPT will continue to coordinate with other federal agencies including, Centers for Disease Control (CDC), Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Department of Justice (DOJ), Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC), and with state, local and tribal governments to reduce or prevent risks to human health and the environment posed by lead-based paint activities.

Background

A key element of EPA's mission and Strategic Plan is to reduce or prevent risks to human health and the environment posed by chemical substances. In certain instances, risk-reduction efforts are targeted at specific chemicals. Foremost among these is the commitment to eliminate childhood lead poisoning as a public health concern by 2010. Since 1973, environmental lead levels have been reduced by phasing out leaded gasoline, banning the sale of lead-based paint for use in residences, and addressing other sources of exposure. As a result of these efforts, children's blood-lead levels have declined nearly 90 percent since the mid-1970s, in the United States.

In the 1990's, EPA focused on reducing children's exposure to lead in paint and dust through a regulatory framework, through federal interagency collaboration, as well as informing and educating parents, home buyers, renters, renovators and the medical community about lead prevention. The incidence of childhood lead poisoning has declined from 900,000 cases in the early 1990s to approximately 300,000 cases through 2002. Additional information can be found at: <http://www.epa.gov/lead.html>.

Proposed Measures of Success

G/O/S	ACS Code	Regional Measure	Unit of Measure	Comments
4.1.1	11A	Number of active individual certifications for lead-based paint abatement activities in the Region	Certifications	Reporting Measure.
4.1.1	12	Cumulative number of authorized state and tribal certifications and training programs for lead-based paint abatement professionals	States and Tribes	
4.1.1	13A	Annual percentage of viable lead-based paint abatement certification applications that require less than 20 days of EPA Regional effort to process	Percent	
4.1.1	13B	Annual percentage of viable lead-based paint abatement certification applications that require less than grantee state-established timeframes to process	Percent	State Grant Template Measure.
4.1.1	21	Number of outreach partnerships addressing lead-based paint hazards and exposure reduction.	Partnerships	.
4.1.1	RRP1	Number of active individual certifications for lead based paint renovation, remodeling and painting activities in the Region.	Certifications	Reporting Measure.
4.1.1	RRP2	Number of active accreditations for lead-based paint renovation, remodeling and painting certification training in the Region.	Training accreditations	Reporting Measure.

Definitions and Clarification of Measures

ACS measure 11A is a reporting measure; EPA Regions, States, and Tribes do not directly control this parameter sufficiently to justify setting targets. Measure 11A seeks to track the inventory of certifications for lead-based paint professionals performing abatement activities. The ACS comment field shall be utilized to provide a breakdown of certifications in authorized States, non-authorized States, and Tribes.

ACS measure 12 is consistent with previous years. It seeks to measure the number of authorized State and Tribal programs who certify lead based paint abatement professionals. In future years the program may look towards a measure to track the number of state and tribal programs certifying RRP professionals.

ACS measure 13A examines the efficiency of the Regions as they process viable abatement certification applications. Viable is defined as a completed application which is ready and suitable for approval or disapproval, containing all requirements for certification. EPA Regions will process certification applications in less than 20 calendar days. The Regional effort is defined as the time needed to process an application; the sum of two timeframes. Timeframe 1 is the number of days elapsed from "Sent to Regions" to "Region Review." Timeframe 2 is the number of days elapsed from "Approval or Disapproval Letter Generated" to "Final Package Sent." The timeframe information should be retrieved from the Federal Lead-based Paint Program (FLPP) database system.

ACS measure 13B, the State Grant Template Measure, examines the efficiency of authorized Grantee-States as they process viable abatement certification applications within the Grantee-State established timeframes. Regions will enter the collective Regional percentage in 13B. An example for calculating 13B, the collective Regional percentage for Region G: Add the number of certifications processed under the Grantee-State established timeframe (9500) and divide by (11A)-the total number of certifications in the Region (12500) to calculate the Region's percentage (76%):

Region G	Certifications (Grantee-State)		Total Certifications %
State R	1500	2000	75
State S	2000	4000	50
State T	6000	6500	92
TOTAL	9,500	12,500	76

13B : 76% (Regional percentage)

The Regions should use the comment field to report their authorized Grantee-State timeframes (number of days taken by the Grantee-State to process a viable application) for each shareholder and the percentage of applications processed under the Grantee-State established timeframe. (The timeframe may vary by State, taking variables such as regulations and contractor processing time into account. The number agreed upon should be a reasonable determination that reflects the length of time that it takes the Grantee-State to process an application, as identified by the Grantee-State and represented to the public.)

Below is an example of the information that should be in the comment field for 13B.

Comment Field:

<u>Shareholder</u>	<u>Timeframe</u>	<u>Percentage applications processed</u>
State R	60 days	75%
State S	45 days	50%
State T	36 days	92%

ACS measure 21, an Agency Senior Management measure, seeks to maintain the number of outreach partnerships. An outreach partnership is defined as a collaborative, on-going project between EPA and an outside party or parties in which there is an agreement to take measures to address lead-based paint hazards and exposure reduction and thus reducing childhood lead poisoning. Examples include cooperative agreements, targeted grants, recognition awards, sustained outreach and educational campaigns, letters of agreement, etc. An agreement is an understanding between parties but not necessarily a formal agreement such as a Memorandum of Understanding.

ACS measure RRP1 is a new reporting measure which seeks to track the inventory of certifications for lead-based paint professionals performing RRP activities. EPA Regions, States, and Tribes do not directly control this parameter sufficiently to justify setting targets. The Regions will use the comment field to provide a breakdown of shareholders, where applicable.

ACS measure RRP2 is a new reporting measure which seeks to capture the number of training accreditations for Renovation Repair and Painting work. Accrediting qualified and competent training providers is an important first step to ensure a smooth transition for RRP and facilitate the certification process for lead based paint professionals.

Proposed Principal Activities for the Regions

- 1) Implement lead-based paint risk reduction education, outreach and regulatory implementation programs in target areas with high concentrations of children with elevated blood levels.
- 2) Continue overseeing the Section 404(G) grant program to maintain a trained workforce of lead-based paint professionals in authorized states and continue operating the program in non-authorized states.
- 3) Continue work to eliminate of childhood lead poisoning through Regional priority efforts in the Midwest Region. EPA Regions 5 and 7 continue to track the number of housing units abated/mitigated for lead and the number of lead contaminated residential properties restored through the Deputy Administrator's Quarterly Management Report.
- 3) Encourage compliance assistance and outreach of the Pre-Renovation Education Rule (406) and Disclosure Rule (1018).
- 4) Promote compliance assistance for the Training and Certification Rule (402) in EPA states and coordinate with state programs, as needed, for 402 rule compliance assistance in authorized states.

5) Pursue opportunities for partnerships to address lead-paint based hazards and exposure reduction.

6) Continue implementing the Lead-Based Paint Renovation, Repair and Painting (RRP) Rule pending promulgation in March 2008, including working with States, Tribes, and territories to encourage successful delegation of rule; working to accredit qualified training providers; providing information and compliance assistance to firms and other regulated parties, as well as beginning the certification process for firms; and providing effective public outreach so that demand for qualified RRP contractors is strong.

ASBESTOS

Strategic Plan Target

- Sub-Objective: 4.1.1 Reduce Chemical Risks. By 2011, prevent and reduce chemical risks to humans, communities, and ecosystems.

The Agency's Strategic Plan has no specific strategic targets for asbestos. OPPTS Regional resources support the reduction of asbestos risks through the implementation of the Asbestos Project Plan.

Long-Term Strategy

EPA issued the Asbestos Project Plan in November 2005 to describe EPA's current and planned actions to ensure a coordinated Agency-wide approach to identify, evaluate and reduce risks to people from asbestos exposure. The plan focuses on improving the state of the science for asbestos; identifying and addressing exposure and seeking risk reduction opportunities associated with asbestos in products, schools and buildings; and better understanding and minimizing asbestos exposures through assessment and cleanup of contaminated sites.

EPA will continue its scientific research on asbestos. The Agency will continue its outreach and technical assistance for the asbestos program for schools, in coordination with other Federal agencies, states, the National Parent-Teachers Association, and the National Education Association. EPA will also continue to provide oversight and regulatory interpretation to delegated state and local asbestos demolition and renovation programs, respond to tips and complaints regarding the Asbestos-in-Schools Rule, respond to public requests for assistance, and help asbestos training providers comply with the Model Accreditation Plan requirements.

Background

Asbestos is the name given to a number of naturally-occurring fibrous silicate materials. When microscopic bundles of asbestos fibers become airborne, they can cause a variety of adverse health effects when inhaled and embedded into the lungs. These fibers may cause serious lung diseases including: asbestosis, lung cancer, and mesothelioma.

EPA's asbestos program focuses primarily on implementing the Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act (AHERA), the Asbestos School Hazard Abatement Reauthorization Act (ASHARA), and the asbestos National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) under the Clean Air Act.

As part of its effort to address asbestos-related issues comprehensively, EPA will continue to coordinate with other federal agencies including the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA), National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC), Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR), and United States Geological Survey (USGS). Quantitative reporting by the regions for this program was begun in 2003. OPPTS anticipates that the current measure will continue to be fine-tuned. Additional information can be found at: <http://www.epa.gov/asbestos/>.

Proposed Measures of Success

G/O/S	ACS Code	Regional Measure	Unit of Measure	Comments
4.1.1	15	Number of school children attending institutions reached through general toxic fibers education and outreach activities.	Children	

Definitions and Clarification of Measures

ACS measure 15 seeks to track the number of children reached through education and outreach activities as well as the type of activities utilized by the Region. The Regions will use the ACS comment field to report what outreach and education activities they coordinated to reach the targeted number of children.

For example, Region G reported that they reached 250,000 school children by participating in 3 distinct activities which should be summarized in the comment field:

- Participated in 6 Local Educational Authorities (LEA) designee workshops, providing specific briefings on the AHERA program requirements. Workshops occurred in Bath, NY; Neversink, NY; Result, NY; Surprise, NY; Brick, NJ; and Good Intent, NJ. 75,000 school children were reached.
- Created 2 fact sheets which were distributed at 3 educational conferences; conference A, Meeting B and Conference C. 50,000 school children were reached.
- One general letter was written for 15 schools within State R; the letter was sent to the homes of 125,000 school children.

Proposed Principal Activities for the Regions

1) Maintain education and outreach efforts to bring schools into Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act (AHERA) compliance.

2) Promote education and outreach efforts, especially with new materials now under development. As an example, education and outreach activities can be delivered to any of the following: Local Educational Authorities (LEAs), School Districts/Boards, individual schools (including charter schools), Principals, PTA's (including individual parents and teachers), maintenance workers, and individual students. This education and outreach can be accomplished through any of the following mechanisms: web products, written publications (fact sheets, booklets, reports), public meetings, conferences, exhibits, community outreach, training sessions, award programs, mass mailings (electronic or postal), and phone calls.

3) Work with training providers to ensure compliance with requirements.

COMMUNITY ACTION FOR A RENEWED ENVIRONMENT (CARE)

Strategic Plan Target

- Sub-Objective: 4.2.1 Sustain Community Health. By 2011, reduce the air, water, and land impacts of new growth and development through use of smart growth strategies in 30 communities that will achieve significant measurable environmental and /or public health improvements.

The Agency's Strategic Plan has no specific strategic targets for CARE. However, part of EPA's strategy is to sustain and restore the health of our communities by directly providing technical and financial assistance.

Long-Term Strategy

The CARE program will continue to fund and support communities to help them build partnerships to understand and address environmental concerns. CARE communities will achieve measurable environmental outcomes and develop the capacity to sustain local efforts to address environmental concerns and build healthy communities. Through this work, the CARE Program will demonstrate the effectiveness of local partnerships for improving local environmental health and meeting Agency goals for protecting the environment.

Recognizing that the Agency has limited resources, it will be able to work with and support only a small portion of the nation's communities. The CARE program will work to make the best practices, tools, and lessons developed through CARE accessible to other communities. The CARE Program will also work with a broad range of governments, organizations, and businesses to help communities find the partners they will need to succeed. The CARE program will continue to promote collaboration across the Agency.

The continued development of the CARE program has allowed OPPTS to lead the effort to build the Agency's capacity to meet the needs of the environmental justice communities. The CARE program will move to OSWER in FY 2009. However, the program is committed to continue partnering with other federal agencies and communities with potential environmental justice concerns to achieve significant measurable environmental or public health improvements through collaborative problem-solving strategies.

Background

The Community Action for a Renewed Environment (CARE) is a community-based, multi-media collaborative Agency program designed to help local communities address the cumulative risk of toxics exposure. Through the CARE program, EPA programs work together to provide technical and financial assistance to communities. This support helps them build partnerships and use collaborative processes to select and implement actions to improve community health and the environment.

Much of the risk reduction comes through the application of over 40 EPA voluntary programs from across the Agency. CARE helps communities choose from the range of programs designed

to address community concerns and improve their effectiveness by working to integrate the programs to better meet the needs of communities. These programs include Diesel Retrofits, Brownfields, National Estuary Program, Design for Environment, Environmental Justice Revitalization Projects, Tools for Schools, and Regional Geographic Initiatives. Since its first round of cooperative agreements in 2005, CARE has funded 52 grants in 27 states, in rural and urban communities. More program information is available at www.epa.gov/CARE.

Proposed Measures of Success

G/O/S	ACS Code	Regional Measure	Unit of Measure	Comments
4.2.2	CARE1	Regions use cross-media teams to manage and implement CARE cooperative agreements in order to obtain toxic reductions at the local level.	Projects	The measure will track the number of projects the Regions support.

Proposed Principal Activities for the Regions

- 1) Provide regional support needed to ensure the success of the region's CARE cooperative agreements
- 2) Consider and implement CARE regional best practices as appropriate. (Regional best practices for support of CARE communities developed by the CARE Program and CARE Executive Team).
- 3) Identify experienced project officers/leaders for each of the CARE projects and provide training and support as needed.
- 4) Strengthen multi-media and cross program regional team organized to support CARE project leaders and CARE community needs.
- 5) Work with CARE Level I projects, through the project officers, to help provide the technical support needed for communities to identify and rank their risks.
- 6) Work with CARE Level II projects, through the project officers, to help communities' access EPA voluntary programs and measure and track results.
- 7) Ensure staff participation in training for new project leaders and national CARE workshop.
- 8) Participate in the evaluation of the CARE projects and support work to develop best practices and lessons learned to improve CARE program.
- 9) Support CARE national teams that have been organized to manage the CARE program and provide support to regional teams

POLLUTION PREVENTION (P2)

Strategic Plan Targets

- Sub-Objective 5.2.1 Prevent Pollution and Promote Environmental Stewardship. By 2011, reduce pollution, conserve natural resources, and improve other environmental stewardship practices while reducing costs through implementation of EPA's pollution prevention programs.
 - By 2011, reduce 4.5 billion pounds of hazardous materials cumulatively compared to the 2000 baseline¹ of 44 million pounds reduced.
 - By 2011, reduce, conserve, or offset 31.5 trillion BTUs cumulatively compared to the 2002 baseline of 0 BTUs reduced, conserved, or offset.
 - By 2011, reduce water use by 19 billion gallons cumulatively compared to the 2000 baseline of 220 million gallons reduced.
 - By 2011, save \$791.9 million through P2 improvements in business, institutional, and governmental costs cumulatively compared to the 2002 baseline of \$0 saved.

Annual Targets

The GPRA/PART targets are pre-established from the projections used to calculate the long-term GPRA/PART goals, and are modified to account for budget reductions and changes in performance trends. The annual national GPRA measures and targets for FY 2009 for all eight centers of results, commit the P2 program to:

- Reduce 494 million pounds of hazardous materials;
- Reduce, conserve, or offset 6,500 billion BTUs;
- Reduce water use by 1,791 million gallons; and
- Save \$67.8 million in business, institutional, and governmental costs through P2 improvements.

The Regional share of the national GPRA targets above represents the Regional stream of results. Thus, the P2 Regional program collectively commits to:

- Reduce 49 million pounds of hazardous materials;
- Reduce, conserve, or offset 1985 billion BTUs;
- Reduce water use by 248 million gallons;
- Save \$32 million in business, institutional and government costs through P2 improvements.

Long-Term Strategy

Currently the P2 Program clarifies its focus through its P2 Vision. The P2 Vision lays out priorities in the areas of Delivery of P2 Services, Greening Supply and Demand, and P2 Integrations and Infrastructure.

1) Delivery of P2 Services

This area focuses on regional P2 outreach efforts to provide P2 tools and technical assistance to stakeholders in accordance with State and regional priorities and the pollution prevention needs of their customers. A vital part of delivering P2 services is continuing the Pollution Prevention

¹ Baselines are the reduction results of the program in the stated year, e.g., the program documented results of 44million pounds of hazardous materials reduced in 2000, and the documented results of \$0 saved in 2002.

State Grant program. The Pollution Prevention Grant Program supports State and Tribal technical assistance programs which help businesses and industries identify better environmental strategies and solutions for reducing or eliminating waste at the source. This NPM guidance to the Regions reinforces the FY 2008 grant guidance which supports the EPA strategic goals and generates quantified outcome performance data. State and Tribal Assistance Grant (STAG) funds also support Pollution Prevention Resource Exchange (P2Rx), a collection of Regional centers that facilitate exchange of P2 technical assistance information between providers and customers.

2) Greening Supply and Demand

This area focuses on increasing demand for available greener alternatives and stimulating next-generation innovation through incentives and tools. Also included in this effort are using the supply chain as a mechanism for change and reducing potential exposure to priority chemicals.

3) P2 Integrations and Infrastructure

P2 integration and infrastructure development focuses on improving tools and systems to integrate P2 in other programs and Agency operations coordinate with other programs, measure results, and evaluate the P2 program.

The P2 program will partner with Regions, States and other Offices to integrate the P2 program as part of the 5-year strategic planning effort. The strategic planning effort will clearly articulate a common understanding of the P2 program's mission as it relates to broader environmental issues, identify opportunities for more consistent collaboration and pro-actively prepare for Agency-level strategic planning exercises. The goals of the strategic planning are to:

- Describe the program's goals over five years;
- Develop objectives or milestones needed to meet those goals; and
- Establish activities of the program, along with outputs and outcomes.

Background

The Pollution Prevention Act of 1990² established a national policy to prevent or reduce pollution at the source whenever feasible. The rationale for this policy is based on the benefits realized from pollution prevention for protecting the environment and reducing risks to worker health and safety, and the substantial savings in reduced raw material, pollution control and liability costs.

The purpose of the program is to implement numerous activities provided for in the Act. These include facilitating the adoption of pollution prevention (P2) practices through technical assistance, developing state and tribal capacity, recognizing excellence in P2, using federal procurement to encourage pollution prevention, and establishing standard methods of measuring results. As intended by statute, the program also works to coordinate P2 efforts and integrate P2 across the agency. In this capacity, the program makes use of the P2-friendly tools and technical expertise of the Toxic Substances Control Act program, also located in the Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics, which creates a risk reduction co-benefit for the program. The program's vision statement is that pollution prevention is the first choice for environmental protection. This mirrors the national policy set forth in the statute that gives the program its basis.

²Pollution Prevention Act of 1990 § 133, 42 U.S.C. § 13101 (1990).

The program accomplishes its mission through seven centers of results:

1) The Regional center generates results from the ten Regions matching grants to State/Tribal P2 programs, source reduction grants to promote P2 practices by industry, and direct regional efforts to facilitate business P2 practices and interstate coordination on promoting P2.

2) The Pollution Prevention Resource Exchange (P2Rx) center leverages results from providing national-level (wholesale) P2 information to state and tribal (retail) P2 technical assistance providers, and from processing the measured results of state P2 programs.

3) The Design for Environment (DfE) center generates results from voluntary partnerships based on DfE multi-disciplinary scientific assessments, tools, and technical guidance to provide understanding to industry, plus standard-setting entities, of a full range of critical hazard, comparative risk, cost, and performance data for industrial processes. As part of DfE, Green Engineering center generates results by working directly with industry, academia, NGOs and government to implement Green Engineering approaches and design concepts.

4) The Green Chemistry center generates results by challenging industry and the research community to develop and implement scientifically innovative and cost competitive green chemistry technologies, and giving Presidential recognition for the same.

5) The Environmentally Preferable Purchasing (EPP) center generates results by providing multi-attribute guidance and assistance to federal agencies in complying with Executive Order 13101, which requires federal agencies to procure “green” products and services.

6) The Partnership for Sustainable Healthcare center generates results from voluntary partnerships with individual hospitals, hospital suppliers, and related healthcare organizations, using a “franchising” approach to P2 technical assistance and an awards program.

7) The Green Suppliers Network (GSN) center generates results by collaborating with Department of Commerce’s Manufacturing Extension Partnership Centers and original equipment manufacturers (OEMs) to provide the OEM’s suppliers with technical assistance on cost-competitive P2 opportunities through environmental and lean reviews.

Proposed Measures of Success

G/O/S	ACS Code	Regional Measure	Unit of Measure	Comments
5.2.1	261	BTUs of energy reduced, conserved or offset by P2 program participants.	Billions of BTUs	
5.2.1	261A	Annual Megawatt-hours of energy reduced, conserved or offset by P2 program participants.	Megawatt-hours	Reporting Measure.
5.2.1	262	Gallons of water reduced by P2 program participants.	Gallons	

5.2.1	263	Business, institutional and government costs reduced by P2 program participants.	Dollars	
5.2.1	264	Pounds of hazardous material reduced by P2 program participants.	Pounds	
5.2.1	264A	Annual pounds of other pollutants reduced by P2 program participants.	Pounds	Reporting Measure.
5.2.1	296	Metric tons of carbon equivalent reduced, conserved or offset by P2 program participants	Metric Tons	Reporting Measure.

Definitions and Clarification of Measures

For all Pollution Prevention measures, “Reduced” is defined to mean reduction through P2 improvements and includes pollution *avoided*. “Reduced” and “avoided” must be related to source reduction, and **not** out-of-process recycling. An example of “avoiding” pollution would be substituting a less hazardous chemical instead of a more hazardous chemical. Out-of-process recycling is when a waste exits a process as a separate entity, undergoes significant handling and is transported from the waste generation location to another production site for reuse, or offsite to a commercial recycling facility or waste exchange. An example of out-of-process recycling is paper that is collected, recycled, taken off-site, goes through a re-pulping process and is used in another product.

Definition of “P2 program participants” is any party who produces P2 results with a link to a P2 program intervention. Examples include but are not limited to: State and local agencies, businesses, manufacturers, nonprofit organizations, and other institutions.

ACS measure 261 tracks the number of British Thermal Units (BTUs) reduced, conserved, or offset. BTUs are a unit of energy and will be expressed in billions. For example, 6,150,000,000 BTUs, should be expressed as 6.15 Billion BTUs. Standard conversion factors between megawatt-hours and BTUs are found on web-based conversion charts.

ACS measure 261A is a reporting measure which seeks to track the number of Megawatt-hours that have been reduced, conserved or offset. Reduced, conserved and offset collectively cover activities that result in less combustion of fossil fuels. This can occur by using fossil fuel energy more efficiently, simply using less fossil fuel energy, or switching to an energy source with a lower fossil fuel impact. For further details and examples, please consult the P2 Measurement Guidance.

ACS measure 262 tracks the gallons of water reduced as a result of water conservation. What is counted is the reduced use of water in the first place. This can be accomplished through conservation and re-use of water. If water pollution is reduced, the gallons of water associated with the pollutant effluent are not counted under this measure. For example, if a facility used a million gallons of water in the previous year and uses only 500,000 gallons of water in the reporting year, they can count 500,000 gallons of water conserved under ACS measure 262.

ACS measure 263 tracks the amount of money saved as a result of the incorporation of pollution prevention practices into the daily operations of government agencies, businesses, and institutions. Institution is defined as an established organization, especially of a public character (e.g., hospitals, universities, group purchasing organization, etc). Please consult the financial cost calculator which provides specific cost savings for specific types, of pollutants. Further details and examples can be found in the P2 Measurement Guidance. This Guidance as well as corresponding attachments, fact sheets, and conversion tools will be available on the Pollution Prevention Intranet website: <http://intranet.epa.gov/opptwork/divisions/ppd/index.htm>.

ACS measure 264 captures the reduction of elimination of hazardous material released to air, water, land, or incorporated into products, or used in an industrial process. Hazardous is used in a broad sense to include federally or state regulated pollutants, including Clean Air Act criteria pollutants and Clean Water Act water quality criteria pollutants and conventional pollutants, but excludes items generally considered of low hazard and frequency recyclable or divertible, such as paper products, cans, iron and steel scrap, and construction waste.

ACS measure 264A is a reporting measure that captures the reduction of other pollutants. Other pollutants are defined as those pollutants not captured as “hazardous materials.” Other pollutants are items generally considered of low hazard, are frequently recyclable or divertible. Examples include paper products, aluminum cans, iron and steel scrap, and construction waste.

ACS measure 296 is a reporting measure in FY09. It will measure metric tons of carbon equivalent (MTCE) reduced, conserved or offset. OPPT will identify major sources of data for this measure and associated conversion methodologies. OPPT and Regions will continue to work together to develop additional guidance on conversion methodologies and tools for the Greenhouse Gas (GHG) measure and the other P2 measures. The P2 Measurement guidance document will provide a complete picture of P2 measurement, promote consistency by clearly documenting program roles and responsibilities, and streamline a measurement approach that unifies planning and reporting. OPPT expects to finalize the P2 Measurement Guidance document for the Regions around May 2008.

Proposed Principal Activities of the Regions

- 1) Administer the P2 state grants program to fund state P2 technical assistance programs and regional P2Rx Centers, which assist businesses in ways that contribute significantly to the Agency achieving its P2 strategic targets. Identify and work with the States and EPA Headquarters to replicate successful pilots for maximum national impact.
- 2) Promote multi-media coordination with (air, water, waste, and toxics programs) within each region to promote P2 outcomes.
- 3) As resources allow, encourage federal facilities within the regions to implement P2 projects (through implementing environmentally preferable purchasing, participating in the Federal Electronics Challenge, implementing environmental management systems, etc.).
- 4) As regional resources allow, provide direct P2 assistance to businesses.

5) Actively engage in the P2 strategic planning process.

6) Actively engage in the P2 STAG tracking, collecting and reporting Project to better link grant activities to performance and better articulate the impact of P2 activities and strategies.

7) Actively engage in developing guidance on how to convert BTUs of energy to metric tons of carbon equivalent and on how to better quantify additional sources of metric tons of carbon equivalent beyond BTUs.

PESTICIDE WORKER SAFETY PROGRAMS

(Worker Protection, Pesticide Applicator Certification & Training, and Outreach to Health Care Providers)

Strategic Plan Targets

- Sub-Objective 4.1.3 Protect Human Health from Pesticide Risk. Through 2011, protect human health by implementing our statutes and taking regulatory actions to ensure pesticides continue to be safe and available when used in accordance with the label.
 - Through 2011, protect those occupationally exposed to pesticides by improving upon or maintaining a rate of 3.5 incidents per 100,000 potential risk events. (Baseline: There were 1,385 occupational pesticide incidents in 2003 out of 39,850,000 potential pesticide risk events/year.)
 - By 2011, improve the health of those who work in or around pesticides by reaching a 50 percent targeted reduction in moderate to severe incidents for 6 acutely toxic agricultural pesticides with the highest incident rates: chlorpyrifos, diazinon, malathion, pyrethrins, 2,4-dichlorophenoxy acetic acid (2,4-D), and carbofuran. (Baselines will be determined from the Poison Control Center (PCC) Toxics Exposure Surveillance System (TESS) database for 1999-2003.)

Strategy

EPA will collaborate with States/Tribes, other federal agencies, industry groups, trade organizations, advocacy groups, community-based organizations, the regulated community and other program stakeholders in efforts to reduce the occurrence of pesticide related incidents in pesticide workers. This includes agricultural workers, private applicators (farmers) and their family members working around pesticides, pest control operators, pesticide mixers/loaders/handlers, and the full range of other workers that may work with or around pesticides. EPA will utilize a number of mechanisms to address issues related to pesticide workers including proposing regulatory modifications, improvements and enhancements to the worker protection standard and the certification and training requirements.

EPA will also coordinate with States, Tribes to ensure that the regulated community is fully informed of the requirements in the regulations and that appropriate mechanisms are in place and utilized to ensure compliance with those requirements. Among other things, EPA will take steps to improve pesticide worker health and safety by: revising the worker protection standard and pesticide applicator certification regulations (40 CFR Parts 170 and 171), providing compliance assistance to the regulated community; developing and supporting outreach and/or education programs; supporting pesticide safety training programs; establishing community-based grant

programs; developing risk-based targeting approaches; providing outreach to health care providers that treat pesticide-related illnesses; and, employing a variety of other innovative approaches to promote pesticide worker safety.

The Regions will be primarily responsible for working with States and Tribes to implement our regulatory field programs, developing outreach and/or education programs to the regulated community related to worker safety, and carrying out special projects or initiatives to enhance the worker safety field program. Headquarters will have the primary lead in national program coordination, coordinating with health care providers and regulatory development activities which include revising the worker protection standard and pesticide applicator certification regulations. Headquarters will coordinate with Regions on national program issues and will involve Regions when conducting activities in a particular Region.

EPA will strive to implement and collect improved data related to pesticide worker safety including occupational safety. This information will be used in program management, to meet federal program achievement goals, and in communications with the public. EPA will also begin to collect additional data from field activities such as inspections. Headquarters will utilize national data collection systems to collect occupational pesticide poisoning information, and the Regions will work with our states and tribal partners to develop and implement the data collection systems for the field activities.

Background

One of the Agency's primary goals under its revised Strategic Plan is to assure healthy communities. This includes safety and health in the workplace. A key part of EPA's strategy for achieving its goal is to reduce illness and incidents associated with occupational exposure to pesticides. Based on EPA's risk assessments, people who work with, or around pesticides, face a high potential for pesticide exposure and pesticide-related illness. OPP has made reducing or preventing occupational pesticide exposures and related illnesses one of its highest priorities. An effective pesticide worker safety program which comprehensively addresses pesticide risks in the workplace is essential to accomplishing the Agency's. Therefore, OPP will continue to emphasize the need for Regions to work with the states and tribes to focus on pesticide worker safety programs. This emphasis will include establishing stronger linkages between the worker protection program and the pesticide applicator certification and training (C&T) program. When appropriate, Headquarters will work with the Regions to increase outreach to health care providers.

Measures for these programs have been developed through a process with the Regions, States, Tribes, and other stakeholders. The measures are intended to provide direction for program improvement, and to describe progress in meeting the Agency goals and objectives. The table below includes a new Pesticide State Grant template measure for 2009, "Total number of certified applicators." The certification of applicators that use the most hazardous pesticides helps assure that these applicators will have the level of competence needed to handle and apply these pesticides with the minimum potential risk to human health and the environment. It is our first line of risk mitigation for the most hazardous pesticides on the market. The Regions will not be expected to enter this data into the ACS system. This data will be obtained from the States as part of the certification program's requirements established in 40 CFR 171(d). OPP

will use the information submitted by states to calculate this measure and enter the results into the ACS system. There are a few important caveats to the Pesticide State Grant template measure that are noted following the table below.

Environmental Justice

Effective implementation of EPA's Worker Protection Standard (WPS) is one of OPP's highest priorities. The WPS program is critical to assuring that agricultural farmworkers are protected from occupational pesticide hazards, and it is also a key component of EPA's and OPP's Environmental Justice (EJ) activities within the pesticide program. According to the most recent findings of the National Agricultural Workers Survey (NAWS), it is estimated that there are nearly 2 million migrant and seasonal farmworkers in the United States. Although the NAWS finding indicate the majority of farmworkers are Hispanic, the farmworker population is very racially and culturally diverse, being composed of people from many different nationalities. Farmworkers also represent some of the most economically disadvantaged people in the U.S., further highlighting the need for EJ focus for this population. According to the most recent NAWS findings, nearly three-quarters of U.S. farmworkers earn less than \$10,000 per year, and three out of five farmworker families have incomes below the poverty level.

Additionally, agriculture is consistently ranked as one of the most dangerous occupations in the nation. Exposure to the elements, pesticides and dangerous equipment are common in farm labor. Falls, heat stress, dehydration and pesticide poisoning are frequent injuries. However, agriculture is not subject to the same safety legislation under OSHA that protects workers in other industries. Migrant and seasonal farmworkers are especially vulnerable to having to endure poor working conditions as well as potential workplace discrimination, and many farmworkers report experiencing prejudice and hostility in the communities in which they live and work. There are varying opinions on the legal status of this population, but data from the most recent NAWS study indicates that 52% of farmworkers are not citizens or legal residents of the United States.

Regardless of their residency status, farmworkers provide an important labor service to agriculture, and the abundant and affordable U.S. food supply benefits greatly from the labor they provide. Therefore, it is vitally important to protect this population from occupational pesticide hazards to ensure their safety in the workplace and viability as a community. EPA's WPS provides important regulatory protections for this population by requiring several safeguards such as training on recognition of pesticide hazards, protection from pesticide exposure, and emergency assistance in the event of a pesticide exposure or injury. OPP will continue to assure that WPS implementation is an EJ priority for the program and a priority field activity for Regions, States and Tribes.

Proposed Measures of Success

G/O/S	ACS Code	Regional Measure	Unit of Measure	Comments
4.1.3	WP1	Number of Region-specific projects or initiatives contributing to the implementation and enhancement of the worker protection (WPS) field	Projects or initiatives	Minimum of one per Region

		program		
4.1.3	CT1	Number of Region-specific projects or initiatives contributing to the implementation and enhancement of the C&T field program.	Projects or initiatives	Minimum of one per Region
4.1.3	26	Total number of certified applicators.*	Certified applicators	State Grant Template Measure. Baseline and targets will be calculated using FY 07 certified applicator numbers reported to EPA Headquarters. Total # of applicators requiring certification in each state can vary depending on, state laws and regulations, population, level of agricultural production, pest pressures, certification costs, and other factors.

***Caveats to Measure:**

- There are varying state requirements for who has to get certified in each state, especially for commercial applicator certification, so the total number of applicators requiring certification in each state can vary greatly depending on state laws and regulations. The total number of certified applicators per state is not based on or directly related to federal certification requirements or funding.
- The total number of applicators certified by a state is not within their control and is not a function of their efficiency or productivity. States have different populations, levels of agricultural production, pest issues, costs to obtain certification, and regulatory requirements for certification. This may affect the number of people who pursue certification and the total number of applicators certified by a state.

A new ACS Pesticide State Grant Template measure was developed for the certification program because it is a better reflection and measure of actual state grant activities funded by EPA's grant dollars than the previous measure, and there are fewer caveats associated with the measure. The new measure also permits more meaningful comparability between states and will enable identification of trends in certification. Additionally, the new measure is subject to less annual variability and has less potential for misinterpretation.

Proposed Principal Activities for the Regions

Regions should assure appropriate implementation of pesticide worker safety programs by States and/or Tribes in their Regions. This includes assuring States/Tribes follow National Cooperative

Agreement Guidance, making appropriate commitments in their work plans and meeting these commitments. In addition, the Region will report, according to the agreed upon format, all relevant activities.

Regions should ensure that all States/Tribes in the Region submit complete C&T accomplishment reporting information, as required by 40 CFR Part 171.7(d), to the Certification and Worker Protection Branch in OPP via the Certification Plan and Reporting database (CPARD). Regions must assure that all States/Tribes enter the required reporting information into the C&T State Plan and Reporting database system by the end of the first quarter of the federal fiscal year. Therefore, States would not be required to enter this data on the State Grant template itself.

Regions should assure that all States and Tribes, as applicable, maintain updated Plans for Certification of Pesticide Applicators (Plans). The Plans must comply with 40 CFR Part 171. Regions must assure that all States/Tribes have entered their complete Plans into the CPARD system; and they must assure States/Tribes maintain those Plans by annually updating the Plans in the CPARD system and entering all applicable information into the CPARD system about any modifications that were made to the Plans during the annual reporting period.

Regions must carry out at least two Region-specific projects or initiatives that contribute to the implementation and enhancement of the worker safety field programs. One project or initiative must be related to the WPS program and one must be related to the C&T program. The goal of the WPS project should be to enhance the protection of agricultural pesticide workers, and the goal of the C&T project should be to enhance the competency of certified pesticide applicators. The projects may entail outreach and education, compliance assistance, stakeholder coordination, program evaluation, state or tribal program capacity building, or other similar project/initiatives that may lead to enhancement of the program. The Headquarters National Program Office (NPO) will provide guidance to Regions on submitting project write-ups and final project reports. Regions must submit final project write-ups to the NPO by October 31st, and projects must be completed by the end of the federal fiscal year. Regions must submit their final project reports to the NPO within 30 days of the end of the federal fiscal year.

EPA is initiating the revision of the worker protection standard and pesticide applicator certification regulations (40 CFR Parts 170 and 171), and will be carrying out a variety of efforts and activities related to the revisions of these regulations. Regions will have the opportunity to participate in this process. Regions should assure they stay abreast of the regulatory development process and communicate with States and Tribes and other regional program stakeholders about the status of the process, providing information to these entities about the process as needed when it is updated and made available. Regions should encourage States and Tribes and other regional program stakeholders to stay engaged and participate in the regulatory development process and provide information and feedback to EPA as appropriate.

Regions should encourage the States and Tribes to adopt Certification and Training Assessment Group (CTAG) recommendations, including at a minimum the adoption of the national core manual & exam and the minimum age requirements for certification of applicators. Other recommendations may also be forthcoming. After notification by Headquarters of the

recommendations, the Regions will work with states and tribes to encourage their implementation. Updated information on CTAG can be found at <http://pep.wsu.edu/ctag/>.

Regions should encourage States and Tribes to adopt the use of national worker safety program materials, including the national core manual & exam, national aerial category materials, WPS Train-the-Trainer materials, and other products. Regions should also work with States and Tribes to identify barriers to adoption of national program materials, and have discussions with their States and Tribes about potential problems with developing a new ACS state grant template measure for the program related to number of States/Tribes adopting national program materials. Regions should report any feedback on these issues to Headquarters.

Regions should support the measures implementation process by working with their States and Tribes in developing the information for the measures. The measures are critical to program management and refinement as well as for addressing the needs of and communicating with the Office of Management and Budget, partners, stakeholders and the general public.

PESTICIDE CONTAINER-CONTAINMENT IMPLEMENTATION

Strategic Target

- Sub-objective 4.1.3: Protect Human Health from Pesticide Risk. Through 2011, protect human health by implementing our statutes and taking regulatory actions to ensure pesticides continue to be safe and available when used in accordance with the label.

This program also supports the activities under sub-objective 4.1.4, Protect the Environment from Pesticide Risk.

Three-year Strategy

EPA will help prepare states and the regulated community to come into compliance with the new regulations. The Regions will work with states so that they can carry out an adequate program to ensure compliance with the rule.

Background

Implementation of the Container-Containment rule is a subset of the Agency's Strategic Plan Goal 4, Sub-objective 4.1.3: Protect Human Health from Pesticide Risk, and supports the activities under Sub-objective 4.1.4: Protect the Environment from Pesticide Risk. The requirements of this rule are designed to minimize human exposure while handling pesticide containers; facilitate safe container disposal and recycling; protect the environment from pesticide releases at bulk storage sites and from spills and leaks at refilling and dispensing operations. The Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP) has made implementation of this rule a priority. Therefore, this guidance will emphasize Headquarters and Regional activities to help prepare state partners for implementation, which is a necessary step in ensure the requirements of the rule are followed by pesticide registrants, distributors and users, and the human health and environmental protections are realized in the field. Measures for this rule have yet to be developed. Additional information on the rule can be found at <http://epa.gov/pesticides/regulating/containers.htm>.

Proposed Measures of Success

G/O/S	ACS Code	Regional Measure	Unit of Measure	Comments
4.1.3	CR2	Number of States that the Region has assessed to determine if they have the capacity to implement the pesticides Container-Containment rules.	Number of states	Change to a reporting measure. This activity reflects the on-going coordination that Regions will have with states and the Region's assessment (not a formal determination) about whether the states have the capacity to implement the Container-Containment regulations.
4.1.3	CR1	Number of meetings, conferences, presentations, and other outreach activities, where information is provided to States, Tribes, Territories, regulated facilities, and/or general public to increase knowledge of the Container-Containment rule	Number of outreach activities	This involves discussing the rule with the States, Tribes, Territories, regulated facilities & general public; providing outreach materials provided by HQ; and sharing questions, issues & needs with HQ.

Proposed Principal Activities for the Regions

- 1) Regions should facilitate implementation of the Container-Containment rule. This includes assuring that states follow National Cooperative Agreement Guidance, making appropriate commitments in their work plans, and meeting these commitments. Regions should report all relevant activities.
- 2) Regions should coordinate with States to implement the pesticide Container-Containment regulations. Compliance is required with the nonrefillable container standards, label and containment requirements as of August 16, 2009. Through the Region's on-going coordination with the States, the Regions should assess whether the States have the capacity to implement the Container-Containment regulations. This is not a formal determination like the determinations of equivalency for existing state pesticide containment regulations or the determinations of adequacy for state residue removal compliance programs that will be made in FY 2008. Instead, it is intended to be part of the on-going cooperation and coordination with the State for implementing FIFRA and, in this case, implementing the Container-Containment regulations. The Region needs to assess the state's capacity to implement the Container-Containment rule as a part of the process of deciding what the Region will do to implement the rule.
- 3) Regions should help States, Tribes and Territories understand the Container-Containment rule and should facilitate outreach to and education of the regulated community (retailers, commercial applicators, custom blenders and pesticide users). This involves discussing the Container-Containment rule with the States, Tribes and Territories; providing outreach materials provided by Headquarters; and sharing implementation questions, issues and needs with

Headquarters. Headquarters will develop fact sheets, standard presentations, How to Comply guidance, compliance checklists and Q&As. In addition, Headquarters will conduct the outreach to registrants. Registrants, pesticide users, agricultural retailers, agricultural commercial applicators, and agricultural custom blenders must comply with the nonrefillable container standards, label and containment requirements as of August 16, 2009. Registrants and refillers must comply with refillable and repackaging requirements of the container standards as of August 17, 2011.

PESTICIDES & ENDANGERED SPECIES

Strategic Target

- Sub-objective 4.1.4: Protect Environment from Pesticide Risk. Through 2011, protect the environment by implementing our statutes and taking regulatory actions to ensure pesticides continue to be safe and available when used in accordance with the label.

Strategy

EPA has collaborated with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service (known jointly as the Services), USDA, states, tribes and stakeholders to improve our efforts to protect federally listed, threatened and endangered species (listed or endangered species) and their designated critical habitat, while at the same time, not placing unnecessary burden on agriculture and other pesticide users. Under EPA's Endangered Species Protection Program (ESPP, or the Program), EPA will continue to incorporate listed species concerns into its routine processes of registration and registration review. EPA will also continue its efforts to provide technical assistance, outreach and education to partners, pesticide applicators and the general public. A particular emphasis will be on training pesticide use inspectors about EPA's processes for protecting listed species and their critical habitat. Increased knowledge and understanding of the ESPP should result in a greater probability that pesticide users will comply with the Program and thus, that listed species will be better protected from possible harm due to pesticide use.

Background

The dual goals of the ESPP are to carry out EPA's responsibilities under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) in compliance with the Endangered Species Act (ESA), while at the same time not placing unnecessary burden on agriculture and other pesticide users.

The ESPP was created in response to federal agency obligations found in Sec. 7 (a) (1) and Sec. 7 (a) (2) of the ESA. Under ESA Sec. 7 (a) (2), EPA must ensure that its actions (e.g., pesticide registrations) are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any listed species and that the critical habitat upon which they depend is not destroyed or adversely modified. To meet this requirement, OPP performs risk assessments leading to an "effects determination," which may or may not result in consultation with the Services. Most of the assessment and consultation processes are performed at EPA headquarters in Washington, D.C., following EPA's Overview Document. Under ESA Sec. 7 (a) (1), EPA must use its authorities to carry out programs for the conservation of listed species. Unlike the assessment and consultation processes, many activities implementing the protection activities of the ESPP occur at the regional, state and tribal level.

Because the ESPP is a new approach to pesticide regulation, and it serves to implement a statute administered by other federal agencies (ESA), there is a need for flexibility in both how we measure success and the steps we undertake to ensure success. The sections below on *Proposed Measures of Success* and *Proposed Principle Activities for the Regions* are intended to be a guide that will be adjusted and improved upon over time, as EPA and its stakeholders gain experience with the ESPP, to ensure that we are operating the Program in a sound, effective manner.

During FY 2009, the field implementation aspects of the Program will continue to focus on these overarching areas: technical assistance, coordination, education, training and outreach. In addition, OECA will begin collecting inspection-related information to establish a baseline picture of compliance with FIFRA-enforceable Endangered Species Protection Bulletins (Bulletins). Therefore, additional emphasis must be placed on educating pesticide inspectors about the Bulletins. Enforcement activities will also be carried out as appropriate.

Endangered Species Protection Bulletins (Bulletins) are the cornerstone of implementing the ESPP in the field. If, as a result of EPA's review of a pesticide, or as a result of consultation with the Services, geographically specific use limitations are necessary to ensure a pesticide registration complies with the ESA and FIFRA, those use limitations will be relayed to pesticide users through Bulletins referenced on the labels of affected pesticide products. Bulletins will become FIFRA-enforceable use requirements once they are referenced on the pesticide label.

Bulletin production and their web-based distribution are EPA headquarters-based activities. Technical assistance, coordination, education, training and outreach for Bulletins and, indeed, for the entire Program, rely heavily on the collaboration of EPA headquarters, regions, states and tribes. If EPA headquarters proposes geographically specific pesticide use limitations to protect a listed species or critical habitat, those limitations will be available for public comment during OPP's routine FIFRA processes.

States and tribes may also be afforded another opportunity for review prior to finalization of the use limitations and issuance of a Bulletin. EPA regions will provide technical assistance during development of such limitations and coordinate comments from their states or tribes at the appropriate times. This may include providing information to EPA headquarters on pesticide use patterns or species locations, reviewing draft maps for accuracy, and reviewing proposed pesticide use limitations for feasibility. EPA headquarters will assist the regions and provide outreach materials to facilitate these activities through continued collaboration on endangered species-related activities.

Additional information on the Endangered Species Protection Program can be found at <http://www.epa.gov/espp>.

Proposed Measures of Success

G/O/S	ACS Code	Regional Measure	Unit of Measure	Comments
4.1.4	3A	Number of meetings, conferences, presentations, and other outreach activities where information is provided to States, Tribes, Territories and/or general public to increase knowledge of the Endangered Species Protection Program.	Number of outreach activities	Primary goal in FY09 is to provide technical assistance, outreach and education to partners, pesticide applicators & the general public

Proposed Principle Activities for the Regions

- 1) Regions will provide communication, coordination, education, and technical expertise to states, tribes and other stakeholders about EPA's processes for protecting listed species and their critical habitat.
- 2) Regions will provide education and technical expertise to pesticide use inspectors about EPA's processes for protecting listed species and their critical habitat. Educational topics should include how to read Bulletins; how to access historic Bulletins for purposes of inspections; familiarity with local Bulletins and the species addressed in them; and the goals of the Program; i.e., to protect listed species from possible harm due to pesticide use, while at the same time, not placing unnecessary burden on agriculture or other pesticide users.
- 3) When appropriate, regions will coordinate comments from states and tribes on Bulletin development and review. This may include providing information to EPA headquarters on pesticide use patterns or species locations, reviewing draft maps for accuracy, and reviewing proposed pesticide use limitations for feasibility. Comments will generally be sought during OPP's routine processes for taking public comment, and during a final Bulletin review phase allowed states and tribes outside of those routine public processes.
- 4) Regions will negotiate endangered species activities with their states and tribes consistent with grant guidance and will provide grant and program oversight. The FY 2009 End of Year (EOY) report, which will include any reportable progress on measures development by states and tribes, and will include the endangered species checklist, is due to OPP by February 28, 2010.
- 5) Regions will contribute their unique expertise to the development, implementation and communication of success measurement tools and additional Program guidance documents.
- 6) Where appropriate, regional endangered species contacts will coordinate within regional offices and other federal agencies, especially the Services.

PESTICIDES AND WATER RESOURCE PROTECTION

Strategic Plan Target

- Sub-objective 4.1.4: Protect Environment from Pesticide Risk. Through 2011, protect the environment by implementing our statutes and taking regulatory actions to ensure pesticides continue to be safe and available when used in accordance with the label.
 - By 2011, reduce the percentage of urban watersheds that exceed the National Pesticide Program aquatic life benchmarks for diazinon, chlorpyrifos, and malathion. (The 1992-2001 baselines as a percentage of urban watersheds sampled that exceeded benchmarks are: diazinon 40%, chlorpyrifos 37%, and malathion 30%.)
 - By 2011, reduce the percentage of agricultural watersheds that exceed EPA aquatic life benchmarks for azinphos-methyl and chlorpyrifos. (Based on 1992-2001 data, 18% of agricultural watersheds sampled exceeded benchmarks.)

Strategy

EPA will protect water resources from pesticide contamination. EPA, States, and Tribes will identify and manage adverse effects to water resources from registered pesticides. The Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP), the Office of Water, and Regions will collaborate to identify and manage the risk of pesticide use to water resources. OPP will use State and Tribal water monitoring data in the pesticide registration and registration review process. The NPM measure is intended to reflect the effort of States and Tribes to manage pesticides of concern in such a way that they can demonstrate progress, in the future, in returning concentrations in the environment to or below water quality reference points. This directly supports the three-step national water quality measure.

Background

Protection of water resources from pesticides addresses Goal 4: Healthy Communities and Ecosystems. Under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), EPA registers pesticides and sets conditions for their use. These conditions can include requirements to protect water resources. EPA also provides funding to States and Tribes to protect water resources from pesticides. Under the cooperative agreement guidance, States and Tribes are asked to evaluate pesticides that have been shown to threaten water quality standards or other appropriate reference points, and to place those pesticides of concern under active management so as to reduce concentrations in the environment that would otherwise result in undue exposure and risk. This evaluation process allows States and Tribes to identify where they need to focus resources to manage the greatest risk to their water resources. Additional information can be found at <http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/health/safely.htm>.

Proposed Measures of Success

G/O/S	ACS Code	Regional Measure	Unit of Measure	Comment
4.1.4	WQ1	Number of evaluated pesticides of concern that have been placed under State or Tribal Program management due to their propensity to approach or exceed national water quality standards or other human health or ecological reference points.	Number of pesticides	Reporting Measure. This measure needs to be a reporting measure because regions cannot commit states to a specific number of pesticides managed prior to completion of cooperative agreement workplan negotiations.

Principal Activities for the Regions

- 1) Regions will negotiate annual State and Tribal water quality commitments consistent with FIFRA Cooperative Agreement Guidance, and will provide annual grant and program oversight.
- 2) Regional Pesticide Offices will consult with Regional Water Offices, OPP, and State and Tribal pesticide and water agencies, as needed, to ensure that appropriate water quality pesticides of interest are identified by the State/Tribe.
- 3) Regions will assist State and Tribal pesticide and water quality management agencies to develop programs to manage pesticides of concern that are derived from pesticides of interest evaluations; i.e., those that have a high potential to threaten water quality standards.
- 4) Regions will work with State and Tribal pesticide agencies to assess current State and Tribal program progress on meeting work plan water quality commitments. Regions will support States and Tribes on reporting the national water quality measures data, including training, and any water quality monitoring data to OPP. Measures information should be entered by States and Tribes into the Pesticides of Interest Tracking System (POINTS, www.wq.wsu.edu) by December 31st, 2009. Regions will then review their State and Tribal POINTS data to assure its accuracy. POINTS data should be final by February 28th, 2010.
- 5) Where appropriate, Regions may review and provide comment on initial and updated State and Tribal Pesticide Management Plans.
- 6) Regions are encouraged to support the EPA pesticide registration review process through the collection and submission of State water quality monitoring data, including data on CWA § 303(d) listed waters due to pesticide impairments.

STRATEGIC AGRICULTURE INITIATIVE (SAI)

Strategic Plan Target

- Sub-objective 4.1.5: Realize the Value from Pesticide Availability. Through 2011, ensure the public health and socio-economic benefits of pesticide availability and use are achieved.

Strategy

Through regional grant programs and outreach, Strategic Agricultural Initiative (SAI) staff will work to foster transition and adoption of farm management decisions and practices that provide growers with a “reasonable transition” towards the use of less and reduced-risk pesticides and alternative pest control methods, as mandated by FQPA. Average percent change in the utilization of reduced risk pest management practices over time per grantee will be determined by regular measurement based on the SAI Transition Gradient. The number of collaborative actions contributing towards partnerships key to U.S. agriculture’s transition towards sustainable, reduced-risk pest management technologies will be reported as a sum of actions per region recorded in the SAI Activities Database.

Background

EPA’s Strategic Agricultural Initiative (SAI) began in FY98 with \$1 million and four FTEs as a pilot program in EPA Regions 4, 5, 9, and 10 in response to the Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA). Based on the successful pilots, EPA expanded the program to all ten Regions through a FY2000 budget initiative of \$1 million. The initiative then expanded in FY2001 to 10 FTEs and \$2 million. The OPPTS Acting Assistant Administrator sent guidance on the use of these resources to the Regions in December 2000.

The initiative develops pest management strategies to identify alternatives to harmful pesticides. Through SAI, EPA is promoting model agricultural partnership projects that demonstrate and facilitate the adoption of farm management decisions and practices that provide growers with "a reasonable transition" away from the highest risk pesticides – as designated by FQPA.

Proposed Measures of Success

G/O/S	ACS Code	Regional Measure	Unit of Measure	Comment
4 .1.5	SA1	Average percent change in the utilization of reduced risk pest management practices over time as determined by the SAI Transition Gradient	Percent increase	Regions 8, 9 and 10 have selected this as a regional priority measure for the Great American West.
4 .1.5	SA2	Number of SAI collaborative actions contributing towards partnerships key to U.S. agriculture’s transition towards sustainable, reduced-risk pest management technologies	Events	Regions 8, 9 and 10 have selected this as a regional priority measure for the Great American West.

Measures Justification and Calculation

SA1 Average percent change justification: The SAI Transition Gradient is expressed on a 0-5 scale and is used to evaluate pesticide risk reduction projects. While 0 reflects no understanding of risk reduction techniques, 5 represents growers who have fully converted to a sustainable system. The SAI transition gradient provides a uniform and consistent measure to evaluate grower progress toward adopting a whole systems approach of integrated crop management, conservation planning and sustainable agriculture with an emphasis on long term outcomes using quantitative measures. This measure is an easy tool for the project coordinator to measure short term project outcomes. It is an indicator of progress towards reducing the use of OPP priority chemicals, and the adoption of reduced risk pest management and sustainable agricultural practices. This measure is used for all regional SAI projects and reported in the SAI Projects Database. The actual calculation is: % change on the SAI Transition Gradient is calculated as: $(\text{project end SAI TG score} - \text{project start SAI TG score} / \text{highest score on SAI TG}) \times 100$. For example, a grantee moving from a base of 1 on the transition gradient and moving to a 2 on the transition gradient would be showing a 20% increase in the transition gradient.

SA1 Average percent change calculation: Each region will determine the percent change on the SAI Transition Gradient scale for each project completed in the current fiscal year based on results reported by the grantee in their final report. The region will average together the percent change for each of these projects and report one figure for the region. Each region will submit their figure for the current fiscal year on a bi-annual basis (mid-year and end of year). OPP staff will then aggregate all of the regional figures for the national measure.

SA2 Number of SAI collaborative actions justification: While this is an output rather than an outcome measure, it is closely tied to both intermediate and long-term desired outcomes of the SAI program and EPA's Office of Pesticide Program objectives. This measure reflects the true field activities of the regional SAI Program Coordinators and is a measure tracked semi-annually in an established SAI Activities database.

SA2 Number of SAI collaborative actions calculation: Each region will report key SAI activities that support the transition away from FQPA targeted chemicals into the SAI Activities database. The database will be updated quarterly, and the numbers will be pulled and aggregated at the national level by OPP staff.

Proposed Principal Activities for the Regions

- 1) Have a portfolio of assistance agreements that fund projects that are in compliance with EPA Order 5700.7: "Environmental Results under EPA Assistance Agreements," requiring grantees to report baseline information and establish outcome performance measures.
- 2) Each Region is responsible for completing input of regional grant information into SAI Projects Database immediately upon grant funding. Updates will be made every six months.
- 3) Work with OPP to improve internal/external communication on pesticide issues.

- 4) Conduct outreach with producers, commodity groups, and other stakeholders to create and maintain partnerships with the agricultural community. Record all outreach and collaborative actions in the SAI Activities Database.
- 5) Encourage and promote cross-media links to other EPA programs.
- 6) Provide feedback to EPA HQ on Regional pesticide transition issues.
- 7) Cooperate with USDA in the work of the Regional Pest Management Centers, NRCS Technical Committees, and Sustainable Agriculture and Research Education (SARE) program.
- 8) Participate in the work of the Federal National Integrated Pest Management Evaluation Group (NIPMEG) in fourth year of cooperation (group comprises SAI, USDA and federal Canadian IPM agencies.)

The SAI regional coordinator is responsible for ensuring that the grantees report their first "score" on the SAI Transition Gradient scale before the project started, and their second "score" after the project is completed. The SAI regional coordinators, will then forward these raw scores on the SAI Transition Gradient scale and the percent change for the region to the EPA SAI headquarters coordinator.

Appendix A: FY2009 NPM Guidance Measures
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances

G/O/S	ACS Code	Measure Text	Non-Commitment Indicator (Y/N)	State Grant Template Measure (Y/N)	Nat. Target	REGIONAL OFFICE										
						01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	HQ
4/1/1	11A	Number of active individual certifications for lead-based paint abatement activities in the Region	Y	N	N/A											
4/1/1	13A	Annual percentage of viable lead-based paint abatement certification applications that require less than 20 days of EPA Regional effort to process.	N	N	72%											
4/1/1	13B	Annual percentage of viable lead-based paint abatement certification applications that require less than grantee state established timeframe to process	N	Y	75%											

Appendix A: FY2009 NPM Guidance Measures
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances

G/O/S	ACS Code	Measure Text	Non-Commitment Indicator (Y/N)	State Grant Template Measure (Y/N)	Nat. Target	REGIONAL OFFICE										
						01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	HQ
4/1/1	12	Cumulative number of authorized state and tribal certification and training programs for lead-based paint abatement professionals	N	N	43											
4/1/1	21	Number of outreach partnerships addressing lead-based paint hazards and exposure reduction.	N	N	70											
4/1/1	RRP1	Number of active individual certifications for lead based paint renovation, remodeling and painting activities in the Region.	Y	N	N/A											
4/1/1	RRP2	Number of active accreditations for lead-based paint renovation, remodeling and painting certification training in the Region.	Y	N	N/A											

Appendix A: FY2009 NPM Guidance Measures
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances

						REGIONAL OFFICE											
G/O/S	ACS Code	Measure Text	Non-Commitment Indicator (Y/N)	State Grant Template Measure (Y/N)	Nat. Target	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	HQ	
4/1/1	15	Number of school children attending institutions reached through general toxic fibers education and outreach activities.	N	N	3 M												
4/1/3	WP1	Number of Region-specific projects or initiatives contributing to the implementation and enhancement of the worker protection (WPS) field program	N	N	N/A												
4/1/3	CT1	Number of Region-specific projects or initiatives contributing to the implementation and enhancement of the C&T field program	N	N	N/A												
4/1/3	26	Total Number of certified applicators	N	Y	N/A												

Appendix A: FY2009 NPM Guidance Measures
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances

G/O/S	ACS Code	Measure Text	Non-Commitment Indicator (Y/N)	State Grant Template Measure (Y/N)	Nat. Target	REGIONAL OFFICE										
						01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	HQ
4/1/3	CR2	Number of States that the Region has assessed to determine if they have the capacity to implement the pesticides Container-Containment rules.	Y	N	N/A											
4/1/3	CR1	Number of meetings, conferences, presentations, and other outreach activities, where information is provided to States, Tribes, Territories, regulated facilities, and/or general public to increase knowledge of the Container-Containment rule	N	N	N/A											

Appendix A: FY2009 NPM Guidance Measures
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances

G/O/S	ACS Code	Measure Text	Non-Commit ment Indicator (Y/N)	State Grant Template Measure (Y/N)	Nat. Target	REGIONAL OFFICE										HQ
						01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	
4/1/4	3A	Number of meetings, conferences, presentations, and other outreach activities where information is provided to States, Tribes, Territories and/or general public to increase knowledge of the Endangered Species Protection Program.	N	N	N/A											
4/1/4	W Q1	Number of evaluated pesticides of concern that have been placed under State or Tribal Program management due to their propensity to approach or exceed national water quality standards or other human health or ecological reference points.	Y	N	N/A											

Appendix A: FY2009 NPM Guidance Measures
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances

G/O/S	ACS Code	Measure Text	Non-Commitment Indicator (Y/N)	State Grant Template Measure (Y/N)	Nat. Target	REGIONAL OFFICE										
						01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	HQ
4/1/5	SA1	Average percent change in the utilization of reduced risk pest management practices over time as determined by the SAI Transition Gradient	N	N	N/A											
4/1/5	SA2	Number of SAI collaborative actions contributing towards partnerships key to U.S. agriculture's transition towards sustainable, reduced-risk pest management technologies	N	N	N/A											
5/2/2	296	Metric tons of carbon equivalent reduced, conserved or offset by P2 program participants	Y	N	N/A											
5/2/2	261	BTUs of energy reduced, conserved, or offset by P2 program participants.(Billions of BTUs)	N	N	1,985 B											

Appendix A: FY2009 NPM Guidance Measures
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances

G/O/S	ACS Code	Measure Text	Non-Commit ment Indicator (Y/N)	State Grant Template Measure (Y/N)	Nat. Target	REGIONAL OFFICE										
						01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	HQ
5/2/2	261A	Annual megawatt-hours of energy reduced conserved or offset by P2 program participants.	Y	N	N/A											
5/2/2	262	Gallons of water reduced by P2 program participants.	N	N	248 M											
5/2/2	263	Business, institutional, and government costs saved through P2 program participants.	N	N	32 M											
5/2/2	264A	Pounds of other pollutants reduced by P2 program participants.	Y	N	N/A											
5/2/2	264	Pounds of hazardous materials reduced by P2 program participants.	N	N	49 M											

Appendix A: FY2009 NPM Guidance Measures
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances

G/O/S	ACS Code	Measure Text	Non-Commitment Indicator (Y/N)	State Grant Template Measure (Y/N)	Nat. Target	REGIONAL OFFICE										
						01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	HQ
4/2/1	CARE1	Regions use cross-media teams to manage and implement CARE cooperative agreements in order to obtain toxic reductions at the local level.	N	N	TBD											

Appendix B: FY 2009 State Grant Template Measures

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances

G/O/S	ACS Code	Measure Text	Nat. Target	REGIONAL OFFICE										HQ
				01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	
4/1/1	13B	Annual percentage of viable lead-based paint abatement certification applications that require less than grantee state established timeframe to process	75%											
4/1/3	26	Total Number of certified applicators*	TBD											

*** Caveats to Measure:**

- Baseline and targets will be calculated using FY 07 certified applicator numbers reported to EPA Headquarters.
- There are varying state requirements for who has to get certified in each state, especially for commercial applicator certification, so the total number of applicators requiring certification in each state can vary greatly depending on state laws and regulations. The total number of certified applicators per state is not based on or directly related to federal certification requirements or funding.
- The total number of applicators certified by a state is not within their control and is not a function of their efficiency or productivity. States have different populations, levels of agricultural production, pest issues, costs to obtain certification, and regulatory requirements for certification. This may affect the number of people who pursue certification and the total number of applicators certified by a state.

Appendix C: Explanation of Changes from FY 2008 to FY 2009

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances

Change from FY 2008 Guidance Document		Reason for Change	Effected Pages and Sections
Priorities	Lead Renovation, Remodeling and Painting (RRP) Rule	In FY09, the RRP Rule will be implemented.	Lead; pages 1-4
	Climate Change – Greenhouse Gas (GHG)	To align the program with other offices in addressing the multi-media issue of climate change.	P2; pages 9-13
	Community Action for Renewed Environment (CARE)	To identify the program as a discrete multi-NPM effort.	CARE; pages 7-8
Strategies	The Lead RRP Rule is expected to be finalized in April 2008. OPPT will establish requirements for renovation work practices, training and certifying renovators and dust sampling technicians, certifying renovation firms, accrediting providers of renovation and dust sampling technician training. .	To reflect activities necessary for implementation of RRP Rule.	Lead; pages 1-4

Appendix C: Explanation of Changes from FY 2008 to FY 2009

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances

Change from FY 2008 Guidance Document		Reason for Change	Effected Pages and Sections
	The P2 program plans to report GHG as a national measure beginning in 2009, to align the program with approaches taken by other EPA offices. OPPTS will measure the GHG in Metric tons of Carbon Equivalent (MTCE) like other NPMs. OAR (Climate Change Program), OPEI (Performance Track), and OSW (WasteWise) all use a GHG measure, rather than BTUs, to calculate energy-related performance results under EPA's Strategic Plan. Measuring GHG broadens the scope of our work; BTUs are a good measure, but they do not capture all the reductions.	To better reflect the energy activities and broaden the scope of the P2 program.	P2; pages 9-13
	The CARE program assists communities to assess and reduce environmental risks by providing technical and financial assistance.	To better communicate program activities to CARE grant recipients, EPA management and external parties.	CARE; pages 7-8
Annual Commitment Measures	Addition- Number of active individual certifications for lead based paint renovation, remodeling and painting activities in the Region.	This measure tracks RRP certifications separate from abatement certifications.	Lead; page 2
	Addition -Number of active accreditations for lead-based paint renovation, remodeling and painting certification training in the Region.	This measure tracks qualified accredited training providers, an important first step in RRP implementation.	Lead; page 2

Appendix C: Explanation of Changes from FY 2008 to FY 2009

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances

Change from FY 2008 Guidance Document		Reason for Change	Effected Pages and Sections
	Modification -11A, 12, 13A, and 13B wording was changed to reflect specific abatement work that will be ongoing.	These measures were modified to include the word “abatement” to make the distinction between RRP work and abatement work.	Lead; page 2
	Deletion – Number of active individual certifications for lead based paint activities in Grantee states. (11B)	This measure was deleted because there was an opportunity to streamline and the information is captured in other measures.	
	Addition -Annual metric tons of carbon equivalent (MTCE) reduced, conserved or offset by P2 program participants.	The measure will better demonstrate program significance relative to critical major environmental issues.	P2; page 11
	Addition - Regions use cross-media teams to manage and implement CARE cooperative agreements in order to obtain toxic reductions at the local level.	This measure captures the universe of projects tracked by EPA Regional staff.	CARE; page 8
	Deletion - Increase the state’s ability to ensure compliance with the residue removal requirements.	The residue removal determinations should be completed by end of FY’08, so this measure can be deleted	
	Modification – Measure text edits WP1 & CT1, CR1, 3A, SAI2	Measures’ texts were modified to clarify and improve measures in response to OCFO comments during streamlining review process.	Pesticide Worker Safety, page 16; Container-Containment, page 20; Endangered Species, page 23; and SAI, page 26

Appendix C: Explanation of Changes from FY 2008 to FY 2009

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances

Change from FY 2008 Guidance Document		Reason for Change	Effected Pages and Sections
	Modification – Measure text edits to 26	A new ACS Pesticide State Grant Template measure was developed for the certification program because it is a better reflection and measure of actual state grant activities funded by EPA's grant dollars than the previous measure, and there are fewer caveats associated with the measure. The new measure also permits more meaningful comparability between states and will enable identification of trends in certification. Additionally, the new measure is subject to less annual variability and has less potential for misinterpretation	Pesticide Worker Safety
	Modification – Measure text edits to CR2	<i>This activity reflects the on-going coordination that Regions will have with states and the Region's assessment (not a formal determination) about whether the states have the capacity to implement the container-containment regulations.</i>	Container-Containment;
Tracking Process			
Contacts	CARE – Deldi Reyes	Contact for new CARE measure.	

Appendix D: Key Milestones for the Negotiation and Agreement of FY 2009 Performance Commitments

March – June 27, 2008	Regions engage NPMs, states and tribes in determining FY 2009 draft regional performance commitments.
April 25, 2008	Text of FY 2009 commitments finalized by NPMs in the ACS; commitment measures opened for bidding.
July 7, 2008	FY 2009 draft regional performance commitments reflecting DRA approval due in the ACS.
July 7 – September 2008	Regions continue to engage NPMs, states and tribes in determining FY 2009 regional performance commitments.
July 14, 2008	FY 2009 draft annual regional commitments are posted on EPA Quickplace site.
September 5, 2008	State and tribal comment period ends on FY 2009 draft commitments ends.
September 19, 2008	FY 2009 regional final commitment information reflecting DRA approval due in the ACS.
September 22, 2008	NPMs begin accepting bids in the ACS.
September 26, 2008	NPMs and regions notify OCFO of any outstanding issues for dispute resolution.
October 6, 2008	NPMs and regions reach agreement in the ACS on FY 2009 performance commitments.
October 10, 2008	FY 2009 final commitments (for which agreement was reached) are posted on EPA Quickplace site.
October 29, 2008	FY 2009 Commitments are locked in the ACS.